



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/864,783	05/24/2001	Indra Laksono	VIXS006	8015
93253 7590 09/26/2011 Garlick Harrison & Markison (VIXS) P.O. Box 160727 Austin, TX 78716-0727				
EXAMINER				
BROWN, RUEBEN M				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2424				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
09/26/2011		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

MMurdock@texaspatents.com
GHMdocketing@cpaglobal.com
ghmptocor@texaspatents.com

Office Action Summary**Application No.**

09/864,783

Applicant(s)

LAKSONO, INDRA

Examiner

REUBEN BROWN

Art Unit

2424

Period for Reply -- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --*

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 August 2011.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ An election was made by the applicant in response to a restriction requirement set forth during the interview on ____; the restriction requirement and election have been incorporated into this action.
- 4) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 5-11, 13-15, 42-48, 50-52 & 54-56 is/are pending in the application.
- 5a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 5-11, 13-15, 42-48, 50-52 & 54-56 is/are rejected.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 9) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 10) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/c2)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: ____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims have been considered but are not persuasive. Applicant argues on page 10 that the combination of Tomich & Paul fails to meet the elements of claim 1. Examiner respectfully disagrees.

In particular, applicant argues two points. First, it is argued that the time division multiplexed signals in Tomich, when combined with the frequency division multiplexing in Paul "would result I the adding the local VCR signal by frequency division multiplexing as taught by Paul". Second, it is argued that Tomich is directed to "signals sent house to house, and not within a house".

Examiner will discuss these arguments in reverse order. Clearly, Tomich (Figs. 1-4; col. 5, lines 1-19; col. 6, lines 6-40) teaches that the system transmits video signals from a headend 20 to a plurality of nodes 18 using time division multiplexing. The video is then received by a roof-top device 22 and passed on to a STB 24 still in time division multiplexing format. The STB 24 can demultiplex the signal using demux 70 and transmit the signals to a plurality of devices, namely TV 32, computer 36, etc. still using a time division multiplexing format, using the multiplexor 72. Thus, examiner respectfully disagrees with applicant's assertion that Tomich does not transmit video signals within a house using time division multiplexing.

Turning to the arguments against Tomich, in view of Paul, examiner disagrees with the assertion that Paul transmits the VCR signals within the house using frequency multiplexing. The reference does not make such a statement. Even though it is true that the local TV video maybe transmitted on unused channels, Paul does not state the over transmission uses frequency multiplexing. However, even it did provide such a teaching, since the base reference Tomich, clearly teaches transmitting signals within the house using TDM, the combination would provide for transmission according to the base reference, which uses TDM.

In view of the above arguments, examiner maintains the rejection of record.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-3, 5, 8-11, 13-14, 42-46, 50-52 & 54-55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tomich, (U.S. Pat # 7,099,316), in view of Paul, (U.S. Pat # 6,381,745) and Foster, (U.S. Pat # 7,675,876) and Wang, (U.S. PG-PUB 2001/0013131).

Considering claims 1 & 42, Tomich teaches a system wherein a local distribution system 14, receives a plurality of media signals from a plurality of different sources and provides them as a multiplexed data stream to a dwelling, see Fig.1 & Fig. 2. The local distribution system 14 receives signals via roof-top unit 22 and transmits the signals a TDMA signal to the STT 24, col. 5, lines 1-21.

The amended claimed, *'method for isolating a channel of interest from a set of channels from a plurality of multimedia sources that include a video network in a multimedia system that includes a multimedia server that is coupled to the plurality of multimedia sources'*, reads on the disclosure of Tomich. In particular, the user selects a desired programming from the plurality of sources that are available and the associated programming is delivered to the dwelling, col. 6, lines 15-55.

As for the additionally claimed *'local media player, such that at least one of the set of channels includes data from the local media player'*, Tomich, but does not explicitly cite that the source could be from a local device.

Nevertheless Paul, which is in the same field of local video distribution as Tomich, provides a teaching of a video content from a VCR 172 being modulated and combined with a plurality of exterior signals to be transmitted to a user, see col. col. 3, lines 1-13; col. 4, lines 20-42; col. 5, lines 10-28. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to modify Tomich with the feature of providing locally stored video programming on a system, as taught by Paul, at least for the desirable of advantage of providing the user with a wider variety of available programs, since the user may want allow multiple terminals to retrieve video programming from a single VCR, which adds to the convenience of the system.

'receiving the set of channels as a stream of data', reads on the disclosure of Tomich that the video programming from the different sources are multiplexed together.

'interpreting segments of the stream of data to identify data of the channel of interest'; and *'interpreting the data of the channel of interest to determine the type of data'* is also met by the disclosure Foster which teaches a broadcast stream comprising one or TV channels and/or one or more programs that are time division multiplexed together, such that that the packets of the different types of data are identified by the details of the header, which is used by the receiver to differentiate and select the particular channel/program of interest, see Abstract; col. 3, lines 15-51; col. 4, lines 29-55; col. 5, lines 10-25. The system of Foster user the PMT & PAT technology to index and identify which particular stream within a transport stream should be selected, based on the selection of the subscriber, see col. 5, lines 37-62; col. 7, lines 55-67; col.

8, lines 55-67; col. 9, lines 1-20. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to modify the combination of Tomich & Paul with the teachings of Foster, including selecting a channel of interest from a time division multiplexed stream of channels, based on its type for the desirable purpose of ensuring that the correct desired program/channel is selected, as taught by Foster.

'processing the data of the channel of interest based on the type of data to produce processed data' and *'providing the processed data for display'* reads on the combination of Tomich & Foster.

As for the additional claimed feature of, *'converting the data of the channel of interest to at least one of RGB and YUV'*, the above references do not teach this feature. However, Wang provides a teaching, wherein decoded MPEG data is converted to RGB format, Para [0036]. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to modify the combination of references to convert decoded MPEG data to RGB format, at least so that it may be displayed in an RGB format display device, as taught by Wang.

Regarding claim 42, Wang also discusses decoding received data, based on whether it is audio (PCM) type data, see Para [0022, 0037].

Considering claims 2-3, 10-11, 13, 43-44, 51-52 & 54, Tomich teaches that the receiver may determine the selected programming by recovering the desired signal, but does not discuss

the details of a stream. However, Foster teaches locating programs/channels within a transport, by using the header/PID, col. 3, lines 25-55; col. 4, lines 56-66; col 6, lines 1-10; col. 7, lines 55-67; . It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to modify Tomich to locate items(s) based on the header/PID, as taught by Wang for the improvement of being sure that appropriate item(s) is selected. Also see Wang, [0036-0038] and Foster, col. 5, lines 10-21; col. 9, lines 61-67 thru col. 10, lines 1-16.

Considering claim 5, the subject matter is met by Wang, [0036].

Considering claims 8-9 & 50, Wang, Para [0022, 0035, 0037] meets the subject matter.

Considering claims 14 & 55, the subject matter is met the teachings in Tomich, col. 6, lines 22-51.

Considering claims 45-46, the recited subject matter is met by the combination of Foster & Wang.

4. Claims 6, 7, 47 & 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tomich, Paul, Foster & Wang, further in view of Leone, (U.S. Pat # 6,901,153).

Considering claims 6 & 47, Schaffner does not discuss the claimed feature of 'Huffman decoding' or 'de-zigzagging the Huffman decoded data to produce the de-zz data' and ''de-

quantizing the de-zz data to produce de-Q data'. However, Leone which is in the same field of endeavor of decoding compressed MPEG data, teaches Huffman decoded video data, which is de-zigzagged and de-quantized, see col. 2, lines 25-36. It would have been obvious for one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to modify Tomich with the feature of Huffman decoding, de-zigzagging and de-quantizing video data, for the improvement of providing a more precisely processed video stream, as taught by Leone. Leone specifically teaches that de-quantizing the data and de-zigzagging the data, removes the diagonal pixel ordering used by the MPEG to improve the run length processing.

Leone also teaches the claimed, 'performing IDCT upon the de-Q data' and 'motion compensation and scaling', see col. 2, lines 30-38 & col. 2, lines 60-67.

Considering claims 7 & 48, Leone teaches converting the YUV to RGB data, see col. 2, lines 50-67.

5. Claims 15 & 56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tomich, Paul, Foster & Wang, further in view of Tsuge, (U.S. Pat # 5,995,709).

Considering claims 15 & 56, even though Schaffner teaches decoding a video stream, the reference does not teach specifics of at least one of: multilevel coding/decoding, non-return-to-zero coding/decoding, block coding/decoding, and nB/m coding/decoding of data streams.

However Tsuge, which is in the same field of endeavor, provides a teaching of non-return to zero (NRZ) conversion, Abstract; col. 7, lines 41-67 thru col. 8, lines 1-21. Tsuge is particularly compatible with the Foster, which includes an MPEG demux 102 and decoder 108 (Fig. 1) for decoding an MPEG stream; since Tsuge is also directed to decoding data included in an MPEG data stream, (NRZ modulated pixel data, which may contain closed caption data), see col. 2, lines 1-25. It would have been obvious for one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to modify Tomich with the features of non-return to zero coding/decoding, at least for the desirable advantage of transmitting text code as NRZ modulated signals, as taught Tsuge, col. 1, lines 15-55.

Conclusion

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

or faxed to:

(571) 273-8300, (for formal communications intended for entry)

Or:

(571) 273-7290 (for informal or draft communications, please label
"PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to REUBEN BROWN whose telephone number is (571) 272-7290. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F(8:30-6:00), First Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Pankaj Kumar can be reached on (571) 272-3011. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300 for regular communications and After Final communications.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Pankaj Kumar/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2424